

REMARKSClaim Changes

Claim 1 is amended to more clearly recite the claimed invention. Support for the changes can be found on page 13, lines 1-16. Thus, no new matter is added.

No amendment made is related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment is made for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant had argued herein that such amendment is made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references. Any remarks made herein with respect to a given claim or amendment is intended only in the context of that specific claim or amendment, and should not be applied to other claims, amendments, or aspects of Applicant's invention.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

The Office Action rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claim 1 is amended to be consistent with the specification as found on page 13, lines 1-16. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection of claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by US 6,584,566 (Hardjono)

Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to clarify the invention. Applicant respectfully submits that Hardjono does not anticipate, either expressly or inherently, each and every element as set forth in independent claim 1, as amended. For example, claim 1 recites “sending a new Visitor Encryption Key (VEK_j) to a mobile member (MM_{ij}) arriving in the corresponding group key management area ($area_j$) when a current Visitor Encryption Key (VEK_j) exists and the current Visitor Encryption Key (VEK_j) has already been used to encrypt a previous Traffic Encryption Key (TEK), wherein only one new VEK_j value is derived regardless of the number of new mobile members that enter the group key management area ($area_j$).

Dependent claims 2-7 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of dependent claims 2-7 and requests the withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejection of claims 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over US 6,584,566 (Hardjono) in view of Non Patent Literature “Secure Group Communications for Wireless Networks” pages 113-117 (Decleene)

Claims 8-10 provide further limitations to what is believed to be an allowable claim 1, as amended. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8-10 under 35 USC 103(a). Applicant requests that claims 8-10 now be passed to allowance.

Conclusion

Applicant has reviewed the other references of record and believes that Applicant's claimed invention is patentably distinct and nonobvious over each reference taken alone or in combination. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicant. Should the Examiner have any questions, comments, or suggestions, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney or agent at the telephone number indicated below.

Please charge any fees that may be due to Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc.

May 7, 2009

Motorola, Inc.
1303 East Algonquin Road
IL01 – 3rd Floor
Schaumburg, Illinois 60196
Customer Number: 24273

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Barbara R. Doutre/
Barbara R. Doutre
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 39,505
Tel. No. 954-723-6449
Fax No. 847-576-3750
Email: docketing.us@motorola.com